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Résumé
Le but de ce travail est de présenter les spécificités de l'approche qu'a nécessité le traitement d'une langue slave, peu connue à cette époque, dans la grammaire slovène Arcticae horulae succisivae de Latinocarniolana literatura (1584). Il ne fallait pas seulement décrire grammaticalement cette langue, mais aussi justifier le bien-fondé de cette description, l'utilité de cette langue ainsi que sa capacité à exprimer des significations différentes. L'article met l'accent sur les caractéristiques suivantes de cette grammaire : 1. l'insistance de la préface (Praefatiuncula) à souligner l'étendue, l'ancienneté et l'importance sociale de la langue ; 2. la tentative d'accroître le caractère utile de la grammaire en incluant un chapitre présentant les orthographes des langues slaves sous forme tabulaire ; 3. l'adaptation de la langue vulgaire au modèle de la grammaire latine.

Abstract
This article presents the specific approaches required for the discussion of Slovenian as a minor, at the time relatively unknown, Slavic language in the grammar Arcticae horulae succisivae de Latinocarniolana literatura (1584). It was necessary to include in the work not only a grammatical description of the language, but also a justification of such a description and an account of the language's usefulness and expressive power. The article focuses on the following characteristics of the work : (1) the emphasis on the wide distribution, antiquity and social importance of the language in the preface (Praefatiuncula) ; (2) the attempt to enhance the " usefulness" of the work by inserting a chapter on the orthographies of Slavic languages in tabular form ; (3) the adaptation of the vernacular language to the Latin grammar model.
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For a language with relatively few speakers, Slovenian received its first grammatical treatment (Arcticae horulae succisivae de Latinocarniolana literatura = BH 1584)1 fairly early – as the ninth or tenth2 among European

1 The title quotation is displayed in five languages on the cover of Bohorič's grammar: 1st line = quotation of the passage (in Cyrillic), 3rd line = Croatian Glagolitic redaction of the Old Church Slavonic version, 2nd line = Cyrillic transcription of the same text from the Glagolitic alphabet (both lines with errors), 4th line = Slovenian text, 5th line = Latin text, 6th line = Ancient Greek text.

2 If we leave aside the “medieval” grammars of the vernacular (Irish, Icelandic, Provençal [Occitan]), which bear only a slight relation to the “Renaissance” grammars (cf. Law 2003, p. 190-204, 234), it was preceded by Italian (Leon Battista Alberti, Grammatica della lingua toscana, 1437-41, first printed 1908), Spanish (Antonio de Nebrija, Grammatica de la lengua castellana, 1492), French (John Palsgrave, Lesclarcissement de la langue françoysse, 1530), Czech (Beneš Optát, Petr Gzel, Václav Philomates, Grammatyka Cžeská, 1533), Portuguese (Fernão de Oliviera, Grammatica da linguagem portuguesa, 1536),
languages. The work was composed in 1584 in Latin by a Slovenian Protestant writer and pedagogue at the Ljubljana *Landschaftschule* (“school of the estates”), Adam Bohorič (ca. 1520–1598). His models were Melanchthon’s Latin grammar and syntax, as well as a sixteenth-century adaptation of Donatus; moreover, my analysis suggests that he may well have been familiar with the grammar of the German language by Johannes Clajus (1578) and with some other contemporary grammars.

The Bohorič grammar provides a basis for tracing certain peculiarities dictated by the discussion of Slovenian as a minor and at the time not fully established European language. The first printed book in Slovenian was published in 1550, that is, 34 years before the composition of the grammar, which came out simultaneously with the Slovenian translation of the complete Bible by Jurij Dalmatin.

I THE PREFATORY EMPHASIS ON THE WIDE DISTRIBUTION, ANTIQUITY AND IMPORTANCE OF THE LANGUAGE

While the body of Adam Bohorič’s grammar – the chapters on etymology, syntax, metaplasms and prosody – limits itself to discussing the Slovenian language (of the other Slavic languages, only Croatian is given a brief mention in the chapter on etymology [BH 1584, p. 67, 69–72]), the comprehensive preface describing the distribution, antiquity and social importance of the language is more far-reaching. While familiar throughout Europe, the topics introduced there were especially prominent in writings on non-Romance languages, of which Bohorič was most familiar with German.

In describing the antiquity and distribution of the language, Bohorič equates Slovenian with Slavic, which allows him to write about it in terms comparable to those used by the largest nations. While fully aware of the differences between Slovenian and the other Slavic languages, he nevertheless relativises them when convenient.

This strategy was facilitated by the highly problematic identification of individual languages as we perceive them today. While the sixteenth century,

---

3 Cf. Ahačič (2007, p. 69–213). I have compared Bohorič’s work to the grammatical writings of Melanchthon and Donatus; to numerous Latin grammars penned by humanist grammarians (Valla, Perotti, Perger, Sulpiitus, Nebrija, Manutius, Despauterius, Linacre, Alvarus, Scaliger, Ramus); to the major works on the vernacular languages – German (Albertius, Clajus, Ölinger), French (de Bovelles, Dubois, Drosée, Meigret, Robert Estienne [Stephanus], de la Ramée [Ramus], Pillot, Garnier, Cauchie, Palsgrave), Italian (Fortunio, Bembo, Corso, Dolce, Castelvetro, Ruscelli, Salviati, Giambullari, Trissino), Czech (Optát, Gzel and Philomates, Blahoslav), and Polish (Statorius); and, of course, to the work of the ancients. For an outline of the general features of the grammar, see Grdina (1999, p. 190–192) and my entry on Bohorič in the CTLF.

4 The “Short Preface” (*Praefatiuncula*) extend to as many as 22 pages.
for example, had a perfectly clear concept of Latin, Greek and Hebrew as languages, even the notion of German was not unequivocal, while the notion of Slovenian and the Slavic languages was only beginning to take shape. For a person of average education (which was, by today’s standards, low) and for the uneducated majority, the differences between Slovenian dialects would have been no smaller than those obtaining between individual Slavic languages. On the other hand, the threshold of knowledge perceived as the “understanding of a language” could hardly have been very high, so that a grounding in Slovenian would have allowed an elementary grasp of other Slavic languages as well. A humanist of Slovenian origins, Sigismund Herberstein, thus claims that the Slovenian language is “the same as Ruthenian or Muscovite” (Simoniti 1979, p. 217). This line of reasoning is further manifested in the tendency to send aristocrats of Slovenian origins on diplomatic missions to Russia, where Latin was of no use.5

The place occupied by Slovenian in the view of the contemporary European intellectual is most easily perceived by scrutinising the description of the “Illyrian language” (De Illyrica sive Sarmatica lingua) as given in Mithridates, a work by Conrad Gessner (1555, f. 52r–56r).6 Among the speakers of the Illyrian (=Slavic) language, he first lists the Muscovites, Slovenians (Sclavi), Bohemians, Poles, and Lithuanians. He notes that the Illyrian language is the most widespread of all (Gessner 1555, f. 52r), covering not only the major part of Europe but even reaching as far as Asia. It may also be called Slavic (Slavonica, Sclavonica), while the Germans refer to its speakers as Wenden/Winden, and to the language itself as windisch (Gessner 1555, f. 52v–53r). Compiling a number of sources, Gessner concludes by giving an alphabetical overview of all Illyrian-speaking peoples.7 The Slovenians are

5 Austria’s contacts with the Russian East were maintained by aristocratic diplomats who came to the Russian court almost exclusively from the Slovenian territory. This certainly gave them a relative linguistic advantage, for business with Russia could not be transacted in Latin, the customary language of such missions. The diplomatic envoys to Russia included the following Slovenian speakers (Simoniti 1979, p. 69–70): (1) the nobleman Georg von Thurn (Della Torre, Georgius Delator) of Görz (Gorizia), sent on a mission in 1490 and again in 1491; the extant sources attest to a certain command of Russian; (2) Georg Schnitzenpaumer, 1514, a legate of Maximilian I, Lord (Ritter) of Sauneck (Žovnek) and High Sheriff (Hauptmann) of Pettau (Ptuj); (3) the above-mentioned Sigismund Herberstein, sent on two Russian missions, in 1516–1518 and 1526–1527; (4) in 1518, Maximilian entrusted the negotiations with the Russian delegates, who had arrived with Herberstein and been received by the Emperor at Innsbruck, to three men conversant with Slovenian – Herberstein himself, Paul von Oberstain (of Radovljica), and Petrus Bonomo of Trieste; (5) as late as the second half of the sixteenth century, Maximilian II asked Charles, Archduke of Inner Austria, to lend him his Vice-Chancellor Johann Cobenzl, Baron of Prosseck and Predjama, for a diplomatic mission to Russia because he knew Slovenian.

6 The description compiles various records on Slavic languages, including the well-known passage from Herberstein which provides their list.

7 Given in the original spelling and arranged in alphabetical order, their list runs as follows: Abgazari / Abgzelli / Gazari, Aeltui, Arbenies, Belis / Božienes / Bohienles, Bohem, Boraffi, Carni, Carniolani, Carinthii utque ad Drauum, Calubi / Calubitae, Circali, Corali, Croati / Chroati, Culmi, Dalmatae / Delmatae, Dibrii, Epirotae, Gepidae, Hungari ad
denoted by the following names: Carnians (Carnī), Carniolans (Carniolani), Carinthians down to the Drava River (Carinthii usque ad Dravum), Istrians (Iſtri), “a part of Pannonia” (Pannoniae pars), and Styrians below Graz (Stirii infra Gretzium), as well as Slovenians (Sclavi, Slavi) (Gessner 1555, f. 54v–55r; 52v).8

The issue was further confused by the fine demarcation line between such terms as language, dialect, and speech, which often expressed the same relationship as the modern terms ‘language group’ vs. ‘language’. According to Gessner’s work cited above (1555, f. 1v–2r), a dialect (dialectus) is

speech displaying the peculiar feature or character of a place, or speech which shows the common character proper to a people (gens). The Greeks distinguish between five varieties of their language: Attic, Ionian, Doric, Aeolian, and the common language as the fifth. /.../ We have noted that the term dialectus sometimes simply denotes speech (sermo) or spoken discourse (oratio articulata), or even conversation consisting of several words, and sometimes (especially in grammarians) the property of a language pertaining to one or several words, by which this language differs from the common tongue or from other similar or cognate languages.9

This was the rule in theory. The actual practice, however, allowed Bohorič a fairly inconsistent use of the terms, enabling him to write a grammar of the Slovenian language while justifying the need for it with arguments applying to Slavic languages as a whole.

The Latin preface (BH 1584, f. *5r) to Bohorič’s Latin-Carniolan (latinocarniolana = ‘Slovenian’) grammar thus refers to “Carniolan people or Slovenians” (homines Carniolani ſeu Slavi), who had not received the Bible in their own dialect (dialectus) until the first Slovenian writer, Primož Trubar (Primus Truber). A few lines later, he observes that now the Carniolans and Slovenians too can see how the Biblical heroes speak in the Carniolan language (Carniolana lingua) (BH 1584, f. *5v), and later still he expresses the hope that he himself will contribute to a more correct spoken and written usage of the

---

8 An identical treatment of the Slavic or Illyrian language is still found in Megiser at the beginning of the seventeenth century (MTh 1603, f. J 8v), almost certainly following Gessner.

Carniolan speech (sermo) (BH 1584, f. **3r). At the same time, Slovenian is said to be a part of the Slavic language (Slavica lingua/genus dicendi) (BH 1584, f. *7r, *8r), since this Slavic/Slovenian language simply varies to some degree as regards pronunciation and spelling among the numerous nations where it is spoken (BH 1584, f. *8r) – just as the “Belgae”, for example, speak German. The Cyrillic, Croatian, Ruthenian, Muscovite, Bohemian, Lusatian or Vandalic, and Carniolan languages (lingua) are thus at the same time idioms (idioma) of the Slavic language (BH 1584, p. 35). Today, such a view of the relations obtaining between languages, dialects, kinds of speech, and language families could be labelled as “terminological inconsistency”, but for research into the primary sources on the language situation, it must be taken into account as “terminological reality”.

The line of argument pursued by Gessner and Bohorič may also be perceived in Megiser’s multilingual dictionary (Mth 1603, f. *8v), dating from the end of the sixteenth century. The fifth table in Megiser’s preface refers to the Slavic/Slovenian language (Sclavonica lingua), which is said to have 21 (groups of) dialects; these include the Slovenian ones – Carniolan, Carinthian (Carantanian), the dialect of Cilli (Celje), etc. – but also all the other Slavic dialects. Nevertheless, most Slovenian words in the dictionary are simply accompanied by the abbreviation Sclav./Scla./Sclavon. (Slovenian/Slavic).

Starting from such assumptions, Bohorič has little difficulty in expounding on the wide distribution and great antiquity of the language discussed in his grammar.

The prefaces to contemporary German grammars (as well as to comparable grammars of other European languages) take the distribution of the language in question as a fact and consequently spend little time on it. 10 Bohorič (BH 1584, f. *5v–*8r), by contrast, is aware that the position of Slovenian in the European public consciousness is such as to call for a “somewhat deeper” argument. He accordingly begins with an exhaustive list of all the areas and peoples pertaining to the “Slavic” language, thus managing to give Slovenian the status of practically the most extensive European language. 11

In doing so, he of course argues for a single “Slavic” manner of speech (genus sermonis Slavicus). Although aware of the differences in pronunciation and spelling between the various nations, Bohorič stresses that the differences within the German language are no smaller (BH 1584, f. *8r):

10 The peoples bordering on the German language territory, for example, include the Poles, Hungarians, Italians, French, English, Scots, Danes, etc. (cf. Albertus 1573, f. a 2r; Olinger 1574, f. *4r).

In all these kingdoms and their parts, I say, the peoples are Slavs and speak Slavic, and from sea to sea they use one and the same manner of speech, namely Slavic. Should anyone, on the grounds of the tiny divergence in pronunciation and spelling, refuse to admit that all these are speakers of the same language, or Slavs, he will strike me as having no better reason for it than if he were to claim that the German language is known only to the Misnians [Meisseners], the Suebi, and their neighbours, whereas others, such as the Belgians, the Saxons, and the adjacent nations, are ignorant of it. But since we consider all these to be Germans and honour them with the name of a common fatherland – because of their common use of language, to be sure –, why should we not apply to the above-mentioned nations, called by the ancients Heneti, Veneti, Windi or Wendi, the name of Slavs for the same reason? Between all these dialects, the manner of pronunciation varies almost less than, for example, between the Misnians [Meisseners], Saxons, or Belgians.12

A similar case is made for the antiquity of the Slovenian/Slavic language. In describing the great antiquity of the Slavs, Bohorič (BH 1584, f. **7r) reaches into the remote past, to the time of the Trojan War itself which, according to his calculations, would have taken place about a thousand years after the Flood:

Even if one were to investigate the first origin and age of the Slovenians/Slavs [Slavorum], one would find them to be an ancient people, for in the famous Greek expedition against Troy, the Heneti came to the aid of their Greek neighbours when summoned. And if the times are calculated correctly, it becomes perfectly clear that the Trojan War was fought more or less a thousand years after the Flood. Thus it transpires that our people ranks with the most ancient ones.13

This topic suggests obvious parallels with Clajus’ treatment of the antiquity of the Germans, although the use of a common topic cannot serve as a proof of direct influence. Clajus (1578, f. )( 2r–)( 2v) reaches even farther back than Bohorič does, dating the origin of the German language to the year 1756 after the Creation, at the same time and place where the other primary languages (with the exception of Hebrew) originated after the confusion of the languages at


13 “Iam il primam originem et vetutatem Slavorum quis inueltiget, is iueniet, eam gentem effe antiquiīdam. Nam in expiditione illa Graecorun aduerlus Trojam vocati Heneti, in auxilium graeis vicinis, venerunt. Et il temperum ratio recte fūdciutur, planum ēt omnino, Bellum Trojanum gellum fūlī, plus minus mille annis a Diluuo. Efficitur tiaque noítram gentem inter antiquīdam effic.”
According to this explanation, the mythological father of the Germanic peoples is Ashkenaz, the grandson of Noah’s son Japheth.

The German grammarian Albertus was likewise aware of the role played by descriptions of antiquity in such prefaces, as evidenced by his concluding remark in the chapter explaining the purpose of the grammar (*Vitilitas et finis huius Instituti*; Albertus 1573, f. a 6v): “It would now remain for me to recount some details about the origins of our language, which are almost to be venerated because of their ancient age, and about its growth and extent. But we shall leave that aside and postpone it for the subsequent editions.”

The importance of a language depended on its ability to match the three holy languages in antiquity and/or distribution.

In addition to the distribution and antiquity of the Slavic/Slovenian language, Bohorič dwells on its social significance (*BH 1584, f. *5r–*5v, **1r–**2v, **4r–**4v). These passages refer to the hypothetical Golden Bull (*aurea bulla*) of Charles IV, which supposedly stipulated that electors’ sons should learn Slavic (*Slavicus*) alongside the other major languages. Moreover, the author underlines the role played by three Slovenians: Francis the Count of Thurn and Sigismund Herberstein, whose activities helped to spread awareness of the Slovenian language, and the first Slovenian Protestant writer, Primož Trubar, who was the first to translate parts of the Bible into Slovenian.

A similar strategy is adopted by, for example, the German grammarian Clajus (1578, f. )*3v–*(4r), who supports the authority of the Germans with three examples: they are heirs to the ancient Roman empire (thus possessing an inherited, “historically” supported right to rule – *ius regni*); they have received the gift of learning the true faith through Protestantism (thus acquiring a right to preside over the priestly vocation – *ius facerdotii*); and, finally, God has given them true knowledge of their language via his instrument, Martin Luther.

### 2 The Chapter on the Orthographies of Slavic Languages in Tabular Form (*Orthographia*; *BH 1584, p. 1–39)

The chapter on orthography (*de orthographia*) is laid out clearly and transparently, but it is hardly a chapter in the strict sense of the word. Rather, it is conceived as an introductory appendix to the grammar in the form of five tables, which present the “orthographies” of five languages. The primary aim of these introductory tables is to enhance the usefulness of the work, since anyone familiar with the basics of Slovenian and with the scripts of other Slavic languages will “easily understand” the latter.

This is brought out in the very title of the grammar, where Bohorič describes the work as a Latin-Carniolan grammar (*Latinocarniolana literatura*) – that is, a grammar of Carniolan (= Slovenian) written in Latin –, but one from which it is

---

14 “Sciendum hoc primum, linguam noltram Teutonicam ortum habuisse eodem et loco et tempore, quo natae sunt aliae omnes, praeter Ebreaem.../. Anno mundi 1756.”

15 “Superesset nunc, ut de origine, quae ob vetustatem pene adoranda est, deque incremento et amplitudine nostratis lingue aliqua commemorarem: venum hic in parergis supersedebimus, caeque in posteriores differemus editiones.”
easy to perceive (*facile deprehenditur*) the affinity (*cognatio*) of the language with the other Slavic languages: Muscovite ("Russian"), Ruthenian, Polish, Bohemian, and Lusatian, as well as Dalmatian and Croatian (*Mofhoviticae, Rutenicae, Polonicae, Boëmicae et Lusaticae lingvae, cum Dalmatica et Croatica*). To reiterate the author’s emphasis: the work is a grammar of the Slovenian language, which, however, has wider application because of the similarities within the Slavic language group. Furthermore, the book cover is proof that the orthography chapter is not designed on a par with the other parts of the grammar, for Bohorič states, in accordance with the contemporary conventions regarding appendices (BH 1584, f. *1r): "All this is preceded by a number of tables containing the Cyrillic and Glagolitic orthographies, and within these, the Ruthenian and Muscovite ones.”

Thus we witness the same dual purpose already observed in the preface to Bohorič's grammar: although describing (only) the Slovenian language, the author wishes to extend the usefulness of this description to other Slavic languages as well, at least at a declarative level.

Chronologically, the orthography chapter is the earliest part of the grammar, composed in the context of working on the language of Dalmatin’s Bible (1584), as described by Bohorič himself in the preface (BH 1584, f. **2v-**3r):

> For when theologians and other select gentlemen among the nobles of Styria, Carnithia and Carniola deliberated last year on the translation and publication of a Carniolan Bible, and sought to decide, among other things, on a certain Latin-Carniolan alphabet to be observed henceforth, and I, by order of the Carniolan nobles, my gracious lords, was in their number: then I was entrusted with the task – I will not conceal it – of writing down in an orderly manner some of my observations on Latin-Carniolan orthography (*orthographia latinocarniolana*), which had been thus far proposed and not rejected: so that the idiom of the Carniolans, as well as the idiom closest and cognate to them, common throughout Carniola and the greater part of Styria and Carnithia, might be henceforth written down by this standard more correctly and methodically, in Latin characters (since the use of that ancient alphabet, namely Cyrillic and Glagolitic, had well-nigh disappeared from our Carniola). I complied with the pious and honest exhortations – indeed, demands more often than not – of these gentlemen, and began to apply myself to the matter. But although I had set out to accomplish only this single task, my spirit carried me beyond my intention: in the same work, by extracting from the common usage of the most correct speech rules for the other parts of grammar as well, and reducing them to a certain method, I wanted to encompass in this little book of mine the whole Carniolan grammar (*grammatica Carniolana*)."
Thus it is only natural that Bohorič's chapter on orthography should fundamentally differ from Melanchthon's in the MGL (the basic model for the rest of Bohorič's text), and that a comparison with the other chapters should clearly suggest a difference in the manner and circumstances of its composition.

While Melanchthon's grammar does contain a final chapter entitled *De distinctionibus* (f. AA 1r–AA 2r), which discusses the same topic as Bohorič's section on punctuation (BH 1584, p. 34–35), the two are completely different. Another possible source for Bohorič's chapter on orthography might have been the treatise *De orthographia* by Joachim Camerarius, written in 1552 and regularly appended to the editions of Melanchthon's grammar. (I have examined the 1585 edition (MGL–Cam, p. 511–528), which is identical to its predecessors.) The treatise comprises the following chapters:

1. the preface (MGL–Cam, p. 511–514);
2. *de accentibus* (MGL–Cam, p. 514–515: merely a general description of stress placement);
3. *de diphthongis* (MGL–Cam, p. 516–517: on the various transcriptions of diphthongs);
4. *de consonantibus* (MGL–Cam, p. 517–519: on consonantal changes in morphology and in word-formation);
5. *de aspiratione* (MGL–Cam, p. 519–520: on the sound h in Latin);
6. *de litteris K et Q* (MGL–Cam, p. 520–521: on the letters k and q);
7. *de duplicatione literarum* (MGL–Cam, p. 521–522: on the reduplication of letters in morphology and in word-formation);
8. *de Graecis litteris Z et Y* (MGL–Cam, p. 522: on the Greek letters z and y);
9. *de litera X* (MGL–Cam, p. 522: on the letter x);
10. *de derivativis* (MGL–Cam, p. 522–524: on the spelling of derived words);
11. *de antiquis* (MGL–Cam, p. 524: on the spelling of archaic words);
12. *de scripturae brevitate* (MGL–Cam, p. 524–525: on abbreviations);

Of all the chapters listed above, the only one to match Bohorič's text is the last, but even here Camerarius includes a description, whereas Bohorič (BH 1584, p. 34–35) simply lists the punctuation marks.

Since comparison with other contemporary European grammars has revealed no essential parallels with Bohorič's treatise either, this chapter may be considered, at least for the time being, as the most original part of Bohorič's grammar. Although a number of contemporary grammatical works address charactere (quandoquidem iam usus illius antquae literaturae, Cyrilicae nimirum et Glagoliticae, in Carniola nostra fere interciddi, pericriberetur Carniolanarum et his proximum et affine per totam Carniolam, Styriac et Carinthiae, majorem partem, ultimatum idioma. Viris illis et pia et honofla monentibus, et faepius etiam flagitantibus morem gelii, huicque rei manum adicere coepti. Venum dum hoc unicum agere inltituo, animo meo praeter inltitutum, me viterus rapiente: eadem opera, de reliquis Grammaticae partibus, ex communi us rectiim loquendi, regulis deprempitis, atque in certam quandam methodum cocaust, totam rem Grammaticam Carniolanam, paruo hoc meo libello comprehendere volui."
similar issues in similar ways, the text is almost certainly the result of Bohorič's own reasoning and experience, rather than the direct imitation of a model.

The structure of the chapter is the following:

**ORTHOGRAPHIA**
(orthography)

1. **cyrilica**
(Cyrillic)
- litterae (letters)
- divisio elementorum
  (division of symbols and letters)
- notae numerales
  (numerical symbols)
- exemplum (example:
  the Lord's Prayer)
- de apiculis et litteris quibusdam
  (on certain diacritic marks and letters)

2. **rutenica et moshovitica**
(Ruthenian and Muscovite)
- litterae (letters)
- divisio elementorum
  (division of symbols and letters)
- notae numerales
  (numerical symbols)
- exemplum cyrilicae
  scripturae (example of the Cyrillic (sic!) script:
  the epitaph of Queen Katarina)
- de apiculis et litteris quibusdam
  (on certain diacritic marks)

3. **glagolitica**
(Glagolitic)
- litterae (letters)
- divisio elementorum
  (division of symbols and letters)
- notae numerales
  (numerical symbols)
- exemplum (example:
  the Lord’s Prayer)
- de apicibus quibusdam et notulis
  (on certain diacritic marks) + observationes (notes)

4. **latinocarniolana**
(Latin-Carniolan)
- litterae (letters)
- divisio elementorum
  (division of symbols and letters)
- numeri per litteras notandi (numbers to be expressed with letters)

5. **oratio dominica**
(the Lord’s Prayer in six languages)

As is evident from the table above, the scripts are arranged by alphabet (Cyrillic, Glagolitic and Latin-Carniolan), with the Ruthenian and Muscovite scripts subsumed under Cyrillic because of their similarities. Moreover, all four tables presenting scripts contain more or less identical sections, except for the Latin-Carniolan one, which stands out with its somewhat wider range.

Of the first four tables, each is introduced by the description of a given alphabet’s distribution. Thus the Cyrillic alphabet is said to be in use “at the court of the Turkish emperor, especially among the bodyguard soldiers called Janissaries. Ditto among all Bosnians (Bosnjenes), Russians (Ruteni), and Muscovites (Mojchovitae)” (BH 1584, p. 1). The second table is likewise dedicated to the reading of the Russian and Muscovite alphabets (BH 1584, p. 11), taking note of their peculiarities. The third table introduces the Glagolitic alphabet as used by the Croats (BH 1584, p. 15), and the fourth the Latin alphabet as used by the Carniolans, that is, Slovenians (BH 1584, p. 25).
The presentation of the alphabets follows the grammar conventions of the period. Each letter is presented according to the following aspects: *figura* (its written ‘shape’ or character), *nomen* (its name), *poteſtas* (its phonetic ‘power’ or ‘value’), and – in the case of Cyrillic and Glagolitic – also *nota numeri* (the information as to which numeral is denoted by a given letter). Such descriptions of letters were standard practice at the time, with the only variations occurring in the headings of the sections; more frequent than tabular presentation, however (which is more modern), was presentation in a running text. Among the German grammarians, Ölinger (1574, p. 1–19) addresses the shapes of the letters (*figurae*) first and then describes in a separate chapter the *potestas et pronunciatio literarum* (the phonetic value and pronunciation of the individual letters). Albertus (1573, f. A 3v) distinguishes, firstly, the shapes of the letters (*maiusculae, minusculae*); secondly, *valor*, which corresponds to Bohorič’s phonetic value of a letter; and, finally, *pronunciatio* (the pronunciation of a letter standing on its own). Statorius (1568, f. A 4r–B 3r) provides a long description of the individual letters with regard to their phonetic value and pronunciation (*potestas, pronunciatio*), but it is fundamentally different from Bohorič’s. On the other hand, the same classification as Bohorič’s (*nomen, figura, potestas*) and an identical graphic presentation in columns are found in Crusius’ school grammar of Greek (Crusius 1560, f. a 4r–a 4v; B 1r–B 1v; see also Crusius 1566), which was undoubtedly well known to the Slovenian author. Melanchthon’s grammars, by contrast, provide no such presentation of the script.

With the exception of the second table, there follows the customary division of the “letters” and other symbols (sounds, numerals, vowels, consonants, etc.) employing the generally accepted terminology. In determining the value of each letter, the author relies on Latin, Greek, and, above all, German. A fascinating insight into the then perception and interpretation of Slovenian sounds is given by Bohorič’s description of the value of certain Slovenian consonants (BH 1584, p. 29):

- double consonants are f [p+h], h [k+h], and z [d+z, according to the Greek model];
- a triple consonant is ŝ [s+k+h];
- a quadruple consonant is č [t+s+k+h];
- a sevenfold consonant is šč [s+k+h+t+s+k+h].

This division is – except in the second table – followed by a description of numerical notation.

The second table is unique in including a section on certain diacritic marks and letters, which distinguish the Ruthenian and Muscovite scripts from the common Cyrillic given in the first table.

All tables (except the “Carniolan” one) conclude with a sample text: the first and third with the Lord’s Prayer in the Cyrillic and Glagolitic alphabets respectively, accompanied by a Latin transliteration and translation. The text given in the second table is not entirely appropriate, since the epitaph of the Bosnian queen Katarina belongs more properly with the conclusion of the first
But as Bohorič appears to have lacked suitable "Ruthenian or Muscovite" texts, he cited an example of the Cyrillic script, "so that its correspondence with the Ruthenian script, as well as the Muscovite, might be perceived thence" (BH 1584, p. 12).

The sixth and last table presents in parallel the **text of the Lord’s Prayer** (all in the Latin alphabet) in “Cyrillic”, Croatian, Polish, Bohemian, (Lower) Lusatian, and Slovenian. Listings of paternosters were popular at the time, since this text was usually among the first to be translated into a vernacular language and thus most readily available to the collector of linguistic examples. The earliest survey of “all” languages (or language groups) of the world with appended versions of the Lord’s Prayer is *Mithridates* by Conrad Gessner (1555). In the Slovenian-speaking lands, a collection of as many as 40 versions was published by Hieronymus Megiser in 1593 (*Specimen; MS 1593*), while Bohorič’s collection – chronologically the third19 – represents the most comprehensive sixteenth-century corpus of Slavic paternosters.20

If we attempt to understand how the similarities, differences and demarcation lines between individual languages were perceived at the time, we recognise that Bohorič’s introduction to his grammar indeed opened the possibility for the reader to understand, at least partly, most of the Slavic languages. At a time when written language was not yet codified and the differences within a single nation were far greater than today, there prevailed a far broader view of similarities and dissimilarities in language practice, and a more tolerant notion of (un)intelligibility.

Moreover, as evident from Dalmatin’s Bible, the parallel presentation of different Slavic scripts would have significantly helped to elaborate the concept of a Slovenian orthography.

**The fourth table.** describing the “Latin-Carniolan” orthography, that is, the orthography of the Slovenian language of the period (the only language discussed by Bohorič in the subsequent chapters), is markedly different from the others in both its extent and meticulousness; particularly striking are the sections *De apicibus* and *Observationes*.

Of the **diacritic marks** (BH 1584, p. 30–32: *de apicibus quibusdam et notulis*), Bohorič treats the grave accent, the acute accent, and the apostrophe.

According to Bohorič, the **grave accent** marks those Slovenian vowels which are set down in writing but have an unclear and barely noticeable pronunciation (*obscure et vix sensibiliter*). Yet even though this label of what we call the semivowel today is merely descriptive, it must be stressed that the description is a very good one, considering that Bohorič had no model on which to discuss the semivowel. This also explains the then habit of transcribing the semivowel with

---

18 Bohorič’s source for this epitaph may have been Palatino (1556, f. G 8r), in which case he would have substantially altered the Latin translation and transliteration. Palatino also gives examples of various other alphabets, which, however, were demonstrably not used by Bohorič.

19 Preceded by the collections of Gessner (1555) and Bibliander (1548).

20 The sources for all the paternosters have not been identified yet. A more detailed discussion of this topic is found in Zwoliński (1968) and Mečkovska (1984, p. 213).
various vowels: it was perceived as an unclear, barely noticeable vowel, which sometimes resembled \( i \), sometimes \( e \), and sometimes \( a \). To mark such semi-vowels with the grave accent was a good idea, but not strictly observed even by Bohorič himself, who often spells \( e \) and \( a \) instead of \( è \) and \( à \), and sometimes \( i \) without the grave.

The acute accent was intended to mark the stressed syllables, according to Bohorič, but only when it was necessary to distinguish between homonyms (BH 1584, p. 30) or when the stress was irregular (judging by BH 1584, p. (6)–(7)).

Finally, the apostrophe served to separate single-letter prepositions from the following words. Here Bohorič includes the rule for using the variants of the preposition \( k/h \), “to”.

The subsequent notes (BH 1584, p. 32–35) again testify to the originality of Bohorič’s reflections on orthography. He proposes that the spelling of phrases where the prepositional object begins with the same “letter” as the preceding preposition should follow the pattern \( v'ola \) (instead of \( v'ola \)) or \( s'inom \) (instead of \( s'inom \)). This, however, did not become common usage: the only other place where it is found is in a surviving fragmentary sheet \( Otročja tabla \), written ca. 1580 (BTa 1580), which is attributed to Bohorič for this very reason.

Of major importance is the section on distinguishing between the vowel \( i \) and consonant \( j \) in writing (not only in pronunciation). Along with distinguishing between the vowel \( u \) and the consonant \( v \), this may be considered one of the more distinctive characteristics of the Bohorič script (bohoričica). The distinction was prompted by new trends in Latin grammar-writing, but also, as explicitly noted by the author, by the distinction made between \( u \) and \( v \) in Cyrillic and Glagolitic. The Glagolitic \( v \), for example, is described as “\( V \) consonans” (BH 1584, p. 16) and the Glagolitic \( u \) as “\( V \) u vocalis” (BH 1584, p. 18), while the Cyrillic \( v \) is similarly described as “\( V \) v” (BH 1584, p. 1) and the Cyrillic \( u \) as “\( V \) ů” (BH 1584, p. 3).

The section on combining letters into syllables (\( De \) combinatione literarum; BH 1584, p. 34) is interesting because of its initial assertion that the basic rules are “the same as for the Latins or the Greeks”\(^{22} \) In grammar books, the rules alluded to by Bohorič are usually found in the chapter \( De \) syllabis (\( On \) Syllables), which belongs among “orthography” chapters. What, then, is the same in Slovenian as in Latin or Greek? Since the same rules are repeated more or less in all grammars, we may cite on this problem Melanchthon’s grammar (MGL, f. aa 6r–aa 6v), which addresses both Latin and Greek examples and thus comes closest to Bohorič:

Here the children should be taught which consonants are correctly linked together, that is, which may combine to form syllables. We often perceive that even the older ones err in this respect, either separating what clings together by nature or squeezing together what should be taken separately. By rights, a syllable should join those consonants which can be taken together at the beginning of a word, that is, the \( mutae \) with the \( liquidae \), as in \( flavus, gnatus, praenus, Tmolus, Tmarus \), etc.; likewise \( s \) with the \( mutae \) \( c \), \( p \) and \( t \), as in

\(^{21}\) As already demonstrated in a table by Kopitar (1808, p. 47–48).
\(^{22}\) “\( E/adem \) e \( ſt \) hic ratio, quae vel apud Latinos vel apud Graecos.”
scutum, sputum, stratum, and in Greek also with $b$: οβέννυμι, οβεςός [sic!], etc. For the Greeks even combine two semivowels, as long as they are not alike: Mnētheus, Mnemon, Smyrna, Smaragdus, as well as two different mutae, as in Cteiphō[n]. Pterelas, bdellium, etc. Following this example, Priscian also links the word-medial consonants in omnis, annis, optus, actus, and similar simple words. In composites, by contrast, the consonants are assigned to its own part each, as in ob-ruo, ab-rado, ab-latus, etc. But I entrust this task to the teachers.23

These basic principles are expanded by Bohorič with a feature unique to Slovenian: any consonant preceding the syllables ja, je, ji, jo, ju forms with them a single syllable (instead of belonging to the preceding syllable as in Latin). While this exception does not encompass all the differences between Slovenian and Latin syllabification, Bohorič nevertheless states the basic principle at least.

The section on spelling foreign words (BH 1584, p. 34) gives the general rule that the original orthography should be retained. The same principle is applied to Greek words in Latin grammars.

Bohorič's section on punctuation (De notis distinctionum; BH 1584, p. 34-35) is surprisingly economical in comparison with other grammars, merely listing the punctuation marks by name and citing them: ““, “:”, “.”, “?”, “( )”. While the corresponding chapter (De distinctionibus) in Melanchthon (MGL, f. AA 1r–AA 1v) is quite different in this respect, Bohorič's arrangement is closer to Camerarius' section on punctuation (De notis distinctionum; MGL-Cam, p. 525-528) in the above-mentioned treatise De orthographia.

3 ADAPTATION OF THE VERNACULAR LANGUAGE TO THE LATIN GRAMMAR MODEL

As a Slavic language, Slovenian differs in many respects from the languages treated in the grammars which afforded direct or indirect models to Bohorič. His grammar thus reveals the general European tendency to present the vernacular in the framework of categories used in Latin grammars (in the case of Bohorič, primarily those by Melanchthon and Donatus), but occasionally it also offers solutions which were dictated by the vernacular language itself.

In the treatment of case (casus), all sixteenth-century European grammars imitated the Latin model, which carried a kind of prestige. Even those vernacular languages which entirely lacked case variation tended to include all the Latin

---

cases in their description. This tendency proved especially problematic for the treatment of Romance languages, which have no cases in the modern sense of the word, but less so for German and Slovenian.24

Of the Latin cases, Slovenian does not distinguish the ablative, while it has two additions: the locative and instrumental. Although Bohorič might have adopted the so-called *casus septimus* (instrumental) or *casus octavus* (locative) from certain contemporary works (e.g. Manutius 1514), he was not familiar with these and thus modelled his description on traditional Latin grammar. As a consequence, his description (BH 1584, p. 44) omits the two cases nowadays called the locative and instrumental, since they “are not in the grammar” – that is, in the Latin (or Greek, or Hebrew) grammar accessible to him. The Latin ablative, however, is preserved since Slovenian “has it in the grammar” – that is, since Slovenian is capable of expressing it with the preposition “od” (“from”) and the genitive. This, however, is not to say that the locative and instrumental were overlooked. Bohorič proposes a solution for the two cases in his chapter on the preposition (*praepositio*; BH 1584, p. 158–164), noting that certain Slovenian prepositions require “special forms of the ending”. His examples also reveal his approach to describing the present-day locative and instrumental: the locative, which follows the prepositions *per* (“at”), *mej/v/meß* (“between”), *po* (“over, through”), *sa* (“behind”), *v* (“in”), *na* (“on”), is defined as *a dative with a special ending*, and the same label is applied to the present-day instrumental, which follows the prepositions *s* (“with”) and *pred* (“before”).

A somewhat different approach is adopted in Bohorič’s description of the Slovenian *tenses* (*tempus*) (BH 1584, p. 95). One of the basic differences between the Slovenian verb system and the Romance or German systems is the expression of verbal aspect, which is formed in Slovenian (and other Slavic languages) not with endings but with prefixes, infixes, and suppletive roots. The Latin model would have enabled Bohorič to distinguish between the following tenses (*tempus*): present (*praesens*), imperfective preterite (*praeteritum imperfectum*), perfective preterite (*praeteritum perfectum*), past perfect (*plusquamperfectum*), and future (*futurum*).25 However, the perfect – that is, the perfective preterite – is not included in Bohorič’s list of tenses. This omission was not customary in the then grammars of vernacular languages; all German grammars of the time, for example, strictly follow the Latin model, as does Statarius’ Polish grammar (1568, f. G 6v). Why, then, does Bohorič omit one of the tenses, and specifically the perfect? The answer is that he apparently viewed the perfective : imperfective opposition as a feature of word-formation rather than of tense-aspect.26

---

26 This train of thought may strike us as unusual today, but in fact even present-day scholarship oscillates between interpreting the Slovenian verbal aspect as a grammatical and as a lexical feature. An exhaustive survey of contemporary views on verbal aspect as a morphological and word-formational category is given by Merše (1995, p. 36–41).
As is evident from the chapter which discusses the verb with regard to its degree of derivational complexity (figura) (BH 1584, p. 96), Bohorič understands the opposition between imperfective and perfective verbs in a purely word-formational sense: *fekam* (“I chop, cut”) is a simple form (figura simplex), while *nafekam* and *perfekam* (two perfective verbs with the basic meaning of chopping or cutting) are complex forms (figurae compositae). Bohorič is fully aware, of course, that some verbs have a perfective and others an imperfective meaning. In the same passage (BH 1584, p. 96), for example, he describes the verb *povedujem* as the “frequentativum” of the word *povejm* (“I tell”), and paraphrases the verb *prepovedujem* as *povejm* “frequenter & identidem” (“frequently & again and again”).

Another interesting detail is that Bohorič describes the formation of the imperfective form from the perfective, rather than the formation of the perfective form from the imperfective, which is today perceived as the more basic process. His concluding note in the chapter on *species* (BH 1584, p. 97) states that verbs denoting continuous actions (verba continuam actionem significantia) may be formed from almost every verb by replacing the present tense ending -am, -em or -im with -avam or -ujem, adding: “And this often happens when verbs are formed with prepositions.”

All this is clearly reflected in Bohorič’s difficulties when discussing the example for the first conjugation (*fekam* “I chop”) (BH 1584, p. 108–109). Under the heading *Praeteritum imperfectum, perfectum, et Plusquamperfectum*, he gives a single Slovenian example, *iest ſim ekal* (“I was chopping”) etc., translating it with all three (!) Latin past tenses (ego secabam, secui, secueram), although he might easily have listed examples not only of the imperfective preterite (*sem sekal* “I was chopping”), but also of the perfective preterite (*sem posekal / sem nasekal* “I cut down / I chopped up”) and the past perfect (*sem bil sekal* “I had chopped”). A note in the section *Observationes* reveals that he was aware of the problem, but had not fully resolved it yet in the framework of contemporary categories (BH 1584, p. 109). Here he observes that we might also distinguish all three past tenses (as Latin grammar does), translating the imperfect *secabam* as *ſim ekal* (“I was chopping”), the perfect *secui* as *ſim bil ekal* (“I had chopped”, the past perfect), and the past perfect *secueram* as *ſim vshe bil ekal* (“I had already chopped”, that is, as a kind of past past perfect).

Of particular interest is Bohorič’s treatment of the Latin gerund forms in relation to the Slovenian verbal noun. Each case of the gerund is discussed separately with regard to its possible translations into Slovenian, which are, in Bohorič, heavily dependent on the gerund’s position in the sentence. This

---

27 “/S/ed frequenter id fit, quando componuntur verba cum praepositionibus.”
approach complies with Melanchthon’s requirement that gerunds should be understood according to the *sententiae structura*, sentence structure (MGL, f. pp 6r). For a clearer perception of Bohorič’s dilemma as to how to present theoretically the possible translations of the Latin gerund, we shall look first at Melanchthon’s description of the latter in MGL (f. pp 6r; MGL-CR, p. 319-320):28

There are only three forms, for example *legendi, legendo, legendum*, which simply have the meaning of the infinitive. And since the situation often forces us to associate the meaning of the infinitive, but without the temporal information [which is conveyed by the Latin infinitive], with nouns, or to employ the infinitive instead of a noun, and as the structure of the sentence requires a case, gerunds have been most usefully invented, as in: Discendi *causa in ludum eo literarium*. In discendo *magnam volupatatem capiunt boni pueri*. Ad discendum *hortatur pater.*29

Thus Bohorič was confronted with the following dilemma (BH 1584, p. 98-101):

(1) If he wanted to translate the gerund with a verbal form rather than a noun, the gerund in the genitive (e.g. *laborandi*) could only be translated with an infinitive (e.g. *tempus eft laborandi: zhas je delati* “it is time to work”; a literal translation of the Latin model would be: *je čas delanja “it is the time of working”*);

(2) The gerund in the ablative (e.g. *laborando*) could only be rendered in verbal form as an adverbial participle ending in -č (e.g. *laborando: delajozh “working”; a literal translation of the Latin model would be: z delanjem “by working”*);30

(3) The gerund in the accusative preceded by the preposition *ad* (e.g. *ad laborandum*) could be rendered in verbal form as a supine (e.g. *ad laborandum: delat “to work”; a literal translation of the Latin model would be: za delanje, k delanju “for working, to working”). As the Latin construction *ad + accusative* can indeed express purpose, this translation coincides with the translation of the Latin supine in -tum.

---

28 MGL-Cam, by contrast, contains no such description. This is one of the few major differences between MGL and MGL-Cam, but it provides no clue as to which version was used by Bohorič.


30 Since the translation of Bohorič’s grammar by Toporišič (1987, p. 123–124) ignores the tradition in which the author works, it gives an interpretative – and incorrect – translation of the term ‘gerund’ as ‘deležje’ (adverbial participle) instead of ‘glagolnik’ (gerund), which alone would afford a deeper insight into Bohorič’s grammar. A similar inadequate construction of Bohorič’s meaning is found in Kolarič (1971, p. 62). This superficial interpretation, based on reading the Slovenian examples without taking note of the Latin text, may be traced throughout the subsequent discussions, which are well summarised by Jesenšek (1998, p. 67–68).
These and similar solutions are likewise found in German grammars, which translate the gerund with the infinitive. If supplied with an article, this infinitive becomes a neuter noun. According to Clajus (1578, p. 108), for example:

Gerunds and supines are expressed by means of the infinitive, accompanied by the preposition zu/mit/von, as in: peritus canendi, geſchickt zu finger [skilled in singing]; paratus ad dicendum, bereit zu fagen [prepared to say]; tacendo refellere, mit ſſillſſchweygen verantworten [to refute by keeping silent] /.../ With the addition of articles, however, they become nouns of the neuter gender l.../, for example: Das schreiben/IPſum scribere, that is: scriptio [writing].

Similarly in Ölinger (1574, p. 104–105):

The Germans have no gerunds or supines; instead, we mostly use infinitives preceded by prepositions, as in: ich hab urſach zu bleiben/mihi cauſa est commorandi [I have a reason for staying]. Mit ſſillſſchweygen veranthwort man viel/tacendo multa refellimus [by keeping silent we refute much].

Although Bohorič, in the theoretical part (BH 1584, p. 98–101), never translates the Latin gerund with the Slovenian verbal noun ending in -nje, he takes a great step away from the Latin MGL merely by introducing into the chapter on the verb the sections verbalia in -nie (deverbal nouns ending in -nie) and verbalia in -v, -ez & -za (deverbal nouns ending in -v, -ez and -za). Following Melanchthon’s MGL, these two sections would belong to the chapter on the noun (and not to the verb chapter as well!) under the heading of species in the section on verbalia, where the following explanation is given (MGL, f. ll 4a):

“Deverbal nouns are those which are derived from verbs or their participles or supines.”

Similarly, verbalia (deverbal nouns) are excluded from verbs by other grammars comparable to Bohorič’s (by Albertus, Ölinger, Clajus).

A different approach, however, is adopted by Bohorič in his treatment of examples illustrating the conjugations of individual verb groups. Here (BH 1584, p. 107, 113, 128, 146), the gerunds ending in -di and -dum are translated with infinitives, but also (!) with verbal nouns, which are of course far more congenial to Slovenian. The gerund ending in -di is thus translated with both the infinitive (biti “to be”, fekati “to chop”, piſati “to write”, lubiti “to love”) and the verbal noun (bitsi “being”, fekaſje “chopping”). Similarly, the gerund ending in -dum is translated with the infinitive (not the supine, as stated in the theoretical part) (piſati “to write”, lubiti “to love”) and with the verbal noun preceded by a preposition (k’bitju “to being”, k’ſekajnju “to chopping”, k’piſanju “to writing”, k’ſeſje “to loving”).
Bohorič’s awareness that there is a fundamental difference between Latin and Slovenian in this respect is attested also by the following statement, which is rarely found in vernacular grammars, including his own work: “The Slovenian language is destitute of gerunds” (BH 1584, p. S33). The passage continues by noting that Slovenian thus often replaces the accusative gerund with “the preposition k [‘to’] and the dative”, with the particle da (“that”) (that is, with a finite subordinate clause), or with the infinitive. Moreover, the following page (BH 1584, p. S34) states twice that the Latin gerund in the ablative may also be replaced with a noun (the part of speech to which the Slovenian gerund (= verbal noun, glagolnik) is in fact assigned in present-day theory).

A similar solution is found in Statorius (1568, f. G 6v–G 7r), who begins by translating Latin gerunds and supines into Polish according to their meaning, and then adds: “But these gerunds and supines belong to the Latins, while the Poles have none. I, however, have given an account of them so as to pave the way to their translation for those less skilled.”
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